

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-39, as amended, remain herein.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a toe section, heel section, strike face, rear-insert, a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert insert, and to recite limitations of former claim 2. See applicants' Figs. 1 and 6 showing a center section having cavity floor 50, which receives insert 25.

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The specification has been amended with minor edits and briefly to describe new Figs. 9 and 10.

1. Objections were stated to the drawings for allegedly not illustrating all of the claim elements, specifically that the figures should be revised to show the wood and iron heads recited in claims 16, 32 and 39. Submitted herewith are copies of new Figures 9-14 showing iron and wood club heads. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

2. Objections were stated to claims 27-30 and 33. Claims 27-30 and 33 have been amended to replace the word "insert" with "rear-insert". Each informality has been amended, thereby mooting those objections.

3. Claims 1, 5, 10, 16, 21-23, (and 24), 27, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Sun et al. U.S. Patent 6,450,894.

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Sun '894 as allegedly disclosing a club head having a toe, heel and center section 11 having a cavity for receiving an insert. But, in fact, Sun '894 discloses center section 11 located between ends 14,15, wherein center section 11 does not include a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving an insert. Sun '894 does not disclose a cavity floor for receiving a rear-insert, as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, Sun '894 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Sun '894 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 5, 10, and 16 which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1, and claims 23, 24, 27, 30 and 32, which depend from claim 21, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 1, 6, 10, 13, 16, 21-24, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Rudell U.S. Patent 4,390,184.

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

The Office Action cites Rudell '184 as allegedly disclosing toe and heel structures with a center section joining them, the center section 23 including a cavity having insert 17. But center section 23 does not include a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving a rear-insert. Rudell '184 does not disclose a cavity floor for receiving any kind of insert, or a rear-insert as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, Rudell '184 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Rudell '184 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 5, 10 and 16, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1, and claims 22-24, 28 and 30, which depend from claim 21, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

5. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rudell '184 and McGeeney et al. U.S. Patent 5,938,543.

The Office Action admits that Rudell '184 does not disclose a powdered metal insert and cites McGeeney '543 as allegedly teaching an insert being made of either metallic or non-metallic materials. However, McGeeney '543 does not provide the deficiencies of Rudell '184 explained herein.

For the foregoing reasons, neither McGeeney '543 nor Rudell '184 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

6. Claims 1, 5, 6, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Ebbing U.S. Patent 4,121,832.

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Ebbing '832 as allegedly disclosing toe, heel, face insert 20, and center section 36 with cavity 42 for holding insert 44. Actually, Ebbing '832 discloses carrier body 16 including striker insert 18 having strike face 36, wherein neither carrier body 16 nor striker insert 18 includes a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving a rear-insert, as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, Ebbing '832 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Ebbing '832 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 5, 6, 16, 17 and 20, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1, and claims 23, 24, 27, 28, 32 and 33,

Serial No.: 10/016,179

which depend from claim 21, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

7. Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ebbing '832.

Ebbing '832 does not disclose or suggest a golf club head including a toe section, heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert, as recited in claim 1, from which claims 18 and 19 depend, as discussed herein.

For the foregoing reasons, Ebbing '832 does not contain any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Ebbing '832 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

8. Claims 2, 3 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sun '894 and Reiss U.S. Patent 4,444,395. Claim 2 has been cancelled and claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of claim 2.

The Office Action alleges that Sun '894 discloses maximizing weight at toe and heel, but admits that Sun '894 does not disclose applicants' recited percentages, and cites Reiss '395 as allegedly disclosing same. However, Reiss '395 does not provide the deficiencies of Sun '894 explained herein, as applied to claim 1, from which claims 2 and 3 depend, and to claim 21, from which claim 26 depends.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Sun '894 nor Reiss '395 contains any disclosure, teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

9. Claims 14, 15 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Rudell '184 and Bauettner U.S. Patent 5,531,444.

The Office Action cites Bauettner '444 as allegedly teaching vapor deposited coating on a club head. However, Bauettner '444 does not provide the deficiencies of Rudell '184 explained herein, as applied to claim 1, from which claims 14 and 15 and 3 depend, and to claim 21, from which claim 31 depends.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Rudell '184 nor Bauettner '444 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

10. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Podgor U.S. Patent 4,749,196.

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, a heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Podgor '196 as allegedly disclosing toe, heel, and a center section with cavity for holding insert 10. Actually, Podgor '196 discloses carrier body 13 including cylindrical disk 10 held in a cavity and facing the strike face 12. Although carrier body 13 includes a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving an insert, such cavity floor is not structured to receive a rear-insert, as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, Podgor '196 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Podgor '196 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 7 and 11, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1, and claim 29, which depends from claim 21, is

Serial No.: 10/016,179

allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 21. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

11. Claims 1, 8-10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Whittlam U.S. Patent 6,422,950

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Whittlam '950 as allegedly disclosing toe, heel, and a center section 46 with cavity for holding insert 54. But center section 46 does not include a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving a rear-insert. Whittlam '950 does not disclose a cavity floor structured to receive any kind of insert, or a rear-insert as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

For the foregoing reasons, Whittlam '950 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under §102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Whittlam '950 that

Serial No.: 10/016,179

would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 8-10 and 16, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

12. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ebbing '832 and "Raines".

Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons explained herein for claim 1.

The Office Action cites "Raines" as allegedly teaching a center section made of aluminum. However, the Office Action does not identify "Raines" by patent number or in any other way. Hence, applicants cannot further respond to this rejection, which is thus far without evidentiary basis.

13. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sun '894 and Fisher U.S. Patent 5,674,132. Claim 25, depending from claim 21, is allowable for the reasons explained herein for claim 21.

14. Claims 34, 35 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Podgor '196 and Reiss; claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Podgor '196 and Buettner U.S. Patent 5,531,444; and claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Podgor '196 and Boznos U.S. Patent 3,134,596.

The presently claimed golf club head includes a toe section, a heel section, a strike face, a rear-insert, and a center section including a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving the rear-insert. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Podgor '196 as allegedly disclosing toe, heel, and a center section with cavity for holding insert 10. Actually, Podgor '196 discloses carrier body 13 including cylindrical disk 10 held in a cavity and facing the strike face 12. Although carrier body 13 includes a cavity having a cavity floor for receiving an insert, such cavity floor is not structured to receive a rear-insert, as recited in applicants' claims 1 and 21.

The Office Action cites Reiss as allegedly teaching to locate weights in the toe and heel of the club head. However, Reiss does not provide the deficiencies of Podgor '196

Serial No.: 10/016,179

explained herein. The same is true for Buettner '444 and Boznos '596 regarding use of vapor deposition and epoxy.

For the foregoing reasons, none of Podgor '196, Reiss, Buettner '444 and Boznos '596 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in any of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1 and 3-39 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1 and 3-39 is respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.



Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

August 31, 2004
Date

RWP:RNW/mhs/ch

Attachments: 3 sheets new drawings Figs. 9-14

Attorney Docket No.: CLEV:564

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220